UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,416	09/10/2003	Jeffrey D. Messerly	END0797US 4619	
27777 PHILIP S. JOH	7590 06/23/201 NSON	EXAMINER		
JOHNSON & J		HALL, DEANNA K		
	N & JOHNSON PLAZ VICK, NJ 08933-7003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jnjuspatent@corus.jnj.com lhowd@its.jnj.com gsanche@its.jnj.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/659,416	MESSERLY ET A	L.			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		DEANNA K. HALL	3767				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress			
WHICH - Extension after SI - If NO per - Failure to Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 K (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Briod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period voor reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this or D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) 🛛 R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 4/7/1	1.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		– action is non-final.					
3)□ S	ince this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is			
c	osed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Dispositio	n of Claims						
4) 🔀 . C	laim(s) <u>1-3,5-8,10-14 and 16-21</u> is/are pendir	ng in the application					
•	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	· ·					
	laim(s) is/are allowed.	The control of the co					
· <u> </u>	laim(s) <u>1-3,5-8, 10-14 and 16-21</u> is/are reject	ed.					
	laim(s) is/are objected to.						
·	laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application	·						
•	ne specification is objected to by the Examine						
•	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 November 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)∐ Th	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice of 3) Informa) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) lo(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/659,416 Page 2

Art Unit: 3767

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgments

- 1. This office action is in response to the reply filed 4/7/11.
- 2. In the reply, the applicant amended claims 1, 5, 7, 16, 20, 21; canceled claim 4. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14 and 16-21 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-8, 10-11 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al. (US 5,275,607) ("Lo") in view of Schwemberger et al. (US 6,589,200) ("Schwemberger"). Schwemberger discloses:

An ultrasonic transducer 12 having a proximal and a distal end; an ultrasonic waveguide 30, Fig. 1 having an ultrasonically actuated blade 38 positioned at the distal end of the waveguide Fig. 2.

Schwemberger discloses the invention as substantially claimed but does not directly disclose the blade being asymmetric and having an end positioned in an overlapping C9L30-36 with at least a portion of the asymmetric portion of the blade. Lo, in the analogous art, teaches a movable asymmetric blade member 30 with an end

positioned in an overlapping C9L30-36 with at least a portion of the asymmetric portion of the blade. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the device of Schwemberger with the asymmetric blade as taught by Lo as an obvious matter of design choice of articulating surgical shears.

Page 3

The lumen of Lo is designed to provide suction or irrigation to a surgical site, see claim 15, C7 L33-43.

The blade of Schwemberger is designed to vibrate in a longitudinal motion coupled with either a transverse or torsional motion, see abstract and thus, the lumen of Lo when combined would be fixed or moveable to a position adjacent to the transverse or torsional node to facilitate suction C5 L40-55. The instrument proximal end has controls for suction and or irrigation C15 L39-46.

5. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwemberger in view of Lo.

Schwemberger/Lo discloses the invention as substantially claimed (see above). However, this combination does not directly disclose the blade defining a channel for irrigation or suction. The channel for irrigation or suction in Lo is within the lumen. Applicant has not disclosed that having the channel within the blade rather than a separate lumen solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it appears that the lumen of Lo, or applicant's channel in the blade would perform equally well. Accordingly, it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lo such that the irrigation or

Art Unit: 3767

suction channel would be within the blade because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over Lo.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/659,416 Page 5

Art Unit: 3767

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEANNA K. HALL whose telephone number is (571)272-2819. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 11:00am-7:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons can be reached on 571-272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DEANNA K HALL/ Examiner, Art Unit 3767 /Theodore J Stigell/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3763